Appl. No. 10/045,482 Amdt. dated August 16, 2004 Reply to Office action of June 17, 2004

Applicants believe that upon considering the patentability of the claims in Group I, the Examiner will be required to search art that is substantially similar to the relevant art for Group II. Thus, there is not an unduly extensive or burdensome search required to appropriately examine the claims of Group II along with the claims of Group I. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is requested.

In the event that Applicant's arguments do not overcome the restriction requirement, Applicant provisionally elects to prosecute claims 13-24, corresponding with Group II.

The undersigned attorney is available for telephone consultation and encourages the Examiner to contact him with any questions that might arise.

Respectfully submitted,

thouse S. Eyned I

Thomas S. Reynolds II Reg. No. 45,262

Docket No.: 088256-9025-00 Michael Best & Friedrich LLP 100 East Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108 (414) 271-6560

X:\CLIENTB\088256\9025\A0875104.1